

City of Chicago
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS
740 N. Sedgwick, Third Floor
Chicago, IL 60610
312/744-4111 [Voice]
312/744-1081 [Facsimile] / 312/744-1088 [TTY]

IN THE MATTER OF

Roy Loving

COMPLAINANT,

AND

Marshall Hotel, Ahmand, Manager & Maid

(Name Unknown)

RESPONDENTS.

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

Case No. 06-II-17

Date Mailed: November 9, 2006

To: Roy Loving
1232 North LaSalle Street, #406
Chicago, IL 60610

Rebecca Dolins
Attorney at Law
1232 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60610

REQUEST FOR REVIEW DENIED

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that, on November 2, 2006, the Chicago Commission on Human Relations denied the Complainant's Request for Review. The Commission finds that it does not state grounds sufficient to have the Commission modify its decision of September 21, 2006 or to reopen this matter for further proceedings with the Commission for the reasons set forth below.

On October 24, 2006, Complainant filed a Request for Review of the Commission's finding of no substantial evidence in the case captioned above. The bases Complainant cited for the request for review were: "1) False information from Respondent, 2) lack of documentation alleged to show Complainant was making a false claim, 3) unsubstantiated 'quotations' made by Complainant, and 4) omitted information presented by Complainant."

Reg.-250.130 (a) states, "a party requesting review must state *with specificity* the reason/s supporting the Request for Review." (Emphasis added). A request for review including only a conclusory statement as to the complainant's disagreement with the finding, and which does not give respondents or the Commission any notice of specific reasons for objecting to the dismissal of a case must be denied. *Jones v. Lake Shore Financial Staffing et al*, CCHR No. 99-E-70 (Apr. 26, 2002). The purpose of a request for review is to provide an opportunity to address specific errors, not simply to revisit an investigation or determination. It is not the Commission's responsibility to conduct a general review of the case to try to identify errors.

In this case, Complainant fails to state with specificity his objection to the Commission's decision. For example, he does not state which information received from Respondent was false, which quotations made by him were unsubstantiated, how the investigation lacked documentation, or which information he presented was omitted. Without this specificity, neither Respondent nor the Commission are able to respond to the Request for Review.

Therefore, the Commission DENIES the Request for Review and reaffirms its finding of no substantial evidence.

CHICAGO COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS
Clarence N. Wood, Chair/Commissioner

TO OBTAIN FURTHER REVIEW OF THIS DECISION, THE COMPLAINANT MAY FILE A PETITION FOR A COMMON LAW *WRIT OF CERTIORARI* WITH THE CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ACCORDING TO APPLICABLE LAW. SEE THE ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW ACT, 735 ILCS 5/3-101.